



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

His educational books were :

1. *Pueriles Confabulationunculae*; or, *Children's Talk*. 1627.
2. *Lessons and Exercises out of Cicero ad Atticum*. 1627.
3. *The first Comedy of Pub. Terentius called Andria* and *The Second Comedy of Pub. Terentius called Eunuchus*. 1629.

Wood (*Athen. Oxon.*, Vol. iii, col. 30) says of the last-named "both very useful for school-boys and are yet used, as his two former school-books are, in many schools." By George Webbe's method the text of Terence was broken up systematically on a method similar to that of modern "analysis" of sentences. He entitled his treatment the Clausulary Method.

It is difficult, I have said, to keep Joseph Webbe and George Webbe separate in one's mind, especially as the clausulary method seems to be advocated by both. The following passage from John Webster probably confuses the two writers, though the latter part of the quotation seems definitely to refer to the would-be patentor of the direct method of Latin-teaching.

"Much to be commended, therefore, was the enterprise of Doctor Web [= Webbe] who found out a more short, certain and easy way to teach the Latin tongue in, than the tedious, painful, intricate and hard way of Grammar, and that by a brief and easy Clausulary Method, in far shorter time to attain perfection therein, and if it had been well followed and improved, would have produced an incredible advantage to the whole nation; but we are in this like tradesmen, who all bandy and confederate together to suppress any new invention though never so commodious to the Commonwealth, lest thereby their own private gain should be obstructed or taken away."—*Academiæ Exam. Examen*. By John Webster, 1654.

Dr. Joseph Webbe also wrote *Usus et authoritas id est, liber feliciter incipit, sub titulo Enthæati materialis primi hexametra et pentametra, etc.* Londini, 1626. 12mo.

FOSTER WATSON.

University College of Wales.

OLD NORSE NOTES.

I. A SECOND OCCURRENCE OF THE FAITHLESS WIFE MOTIF IN OLD NORSE.

In the introduction to an edition of the *Hálfs saga*,¹ while discussing the episode related in Chap. 8, the Old Norse representative of a widely spread tale of a faithless wife, I have given expression to the commonly held belief that there is no other trace of this tale in Old Norse literature. My friend, Dr. C. N. Gould of Chicago University, has, however, since called my attention to another anecdote of this character, which ought to be recorded.

In the *Göngu-Hrólfs saga*, an interesting Icelandic work presumably of the fourteenth century,² it is related that Ingibjörg, the wife of Björn, Jarl Þorgny's councillor, was seduced by a certain Mǫndull Pattason, and further that the faithless conduct of the wife was perpetrated under the eyes of her husband ("Birni ásjáanda"). Björn was bound hand and foot (p. 307) and was to be hanged, a result of the machinations of Mǫndull, who had brought him into disfavor with the Jarl and among other things made him appear guilty of theft of the latter's valuable belt, the gift of Mǫndull. For the rest it appears that Mǫndull is a dwarf and that he has employed magic means to secure the affection of Björn's wife (she becomes black and swollen as a result of this magic and is restored to her normal condition by the application of a magic ointment and the drinking of a remembrance-potion, *minnisveig*). The rescuer of Björn is none other than Göngu-Hrólfr, who compels the dwarf to free Björn, release Ingibjörg from the spell and restore to their proper place and function Hrólfr's severed feet. All this Mǫndull does and disappears, to return afterwards, however (p. 316 ff.), and render Hrólfr further assistance.

The essential situation of this tale,³ viz., the helpless husband, perforce an eye-witness to his wife's infidelity, is then here preserved; the other features are mostly taken from the Icelandic su-

¹ *Altnordische Sagabibliothek*, Heft 14. Halle, 1909, p. 19.

² *Fornaldarsögur Norðrlanda*, ed. Rafn, III, p. 298 ff.

³ Cf. Antoniewicz, *Anz. f. deutsch. Altert.*, XIV, 245, 1888.

perstitutions relative to dwarfs and the whole loosely incorporated in the narrative of Hrólfr.⁴

II. SIGURÐAKVIÐA EN SKAMMA 12.

This strophe reads in Gering's edition of the Eddic poems⁵:

<i>Líftum sun fara</i>	<i>feþr í sinni,</i>
<i>skalat ulf ala</i>	<i>ungan lengi ;</i>
<i>hveim verþr hólþa</i>	<i>hefnð léttari</i>
<i>síþan til sáttu,</i>	<i>at sunr líft.</i>

The general meaning of the strophe is perfectly clear: Brynhildr having in the previous strophe urged her husband to kill Sigurðr, suggests in these lines that the latter's young son be also put out of the way, lest he later take vengeance for his father's death.

Into this strophe Gering has admitted but one textual emendation, viz., the addition of the negative suffix *t* to the *líft* of *Codex regius*, an emendation originating with Svend Grundtvig⁶ and accepted by Finnur Jónsson,⁷ by Bugge,⁸ and by Sijmons.⁹ The Grimm brothers retained the reading *líft* of the Codex, punctuating at the end with an interrogation point,¹⁰ which interpretation a variety of editors have followed since.¹¹ That none of these readings is satisfactory¹² is apparent enough to one attempting to read the strophe and is acknowledged by Sijmons.¹³

While reading this poem the feeling that the context required *síþr* rather than *síþan* led me to

consult the phototypic edition of *Codex regius*,¹⁴ where I found *sþ*, which in this ms. is the common abbreviation for *síþan* and *síþr*.¹⁵ This abbreviation has in several places of the Edda been resolved differently by different editors,¹⁶ and in fact in our strophe Rask¹⁷ has read *síþr*, though his reading appears to have remained unnoticed since and is not included in Gering's variant-apparatus. Rask's punctuation, especially the interrogation point at the end of the strophe, does not, however, correspond with my interpretation, and I trust it will not be superfluous again to call attention to the strophe. *Síþr* is metrically preferable to *síþan*, giving a regular tetrasyllabic half-verse of A-type, while it gives, without textual emendations of any sort, the meaning required by the context.

The last two verses would then read:

<i>hveim verþr hólþa</i>	<i>hefnð léttari,</i>
<i>síþr til sáttu,</i>	<i>at sunr líft.</i>

And the meaning of the strophe would be: "Let us send the son along with the father, one should not long foster the young wolf; vengeance upon any man is easier and he has less chance of reconciliation, as long as the son (of the man he has killed) still lives."¹⁸

III. THE RELATION OF *Völuspá* TO *Baldrs draumar*.

The short Eddic poem, *Baldrs draumar* (also called *Vegtamskviða*), was not included in the Eddic *Codex regius*, but is preserved in the considerably later ms. *AM* 748, 4°. As to the age of the poem itself there is general disagreement among Norse scholars, only a small minority claiming for it any considerable degree of an-

¹⁴ Curav. Wimmer and Jónsson, Kbh., 1891, p. 68.

¹⁵ Cf. Introduction, p. lii.

¹⁶ Cf. Gering, *Vollständiges Wörterbuch zu den Liedern der Edda*, 1903, pp. 920-922 and the apparatus in Gering's Edda-edition under passages cited.

¹⁷ *Edda Sæmundar hinns fróða*, Stockholm, 1818, p. 217.

¹⁸ For *hefna* with dative of person upon whom vengeance is taken cf. Fritzner, *Ordbog*, i, 750, for the construction *hveim verþr síþr til sáttu*, at—cf. Fritzner, *op. cit.*, iii, 914, with the citation from *Heilagramanna saga*, ed. Unger, Christiania, 1877, ii, 44, *þeir ugþo—, at þeim myndi nekkvet til meins verða, ef þeir görði þat.* (*nekkvet* is here adverbial like *síþr*).

⁴ In speaking of the Sanskrit version of this tale (*Hálfs saga*, p. 18), I have misstated the source, which is Somadeva Bhatta's *Kathāsaritsāgara* (ed. Durgāprasād & Parāb, Bombay, 1889, p. 366 f.; translated by C. H. Tawney, Calcutta, 1880-84 [*Bibliotheca Indica*], ii, p. 53 f.); the Pancatantra-story (iv, 5, ed. Hertel, Cambridge, 1908 [= *Harvard Oriental Series*, 11] 244 ff.), is at best but remotely related.

⁵ *Lieder der älteren Edda*, Paderborn, 1904, p. 346 f.

⁶ *Sæmundar Edda*, Kbh., 1868, p. 128.

⁷ *Eddalieder*, ii, p. 55, Halle, 1890; he emended further *hefnð* to *hōnd*.

⁸ *PBBetr.* xxii, 119 f., 1897; Bugge also approved of Jónsson's emendation of *hefnð* to *hōnd*.

⁹ *Lieder der Edda*, p. 369, Halle, 1901.

¹⁰ *Lieder der alten Edda*, Berlin, 1815, p. 246.

¹¹ For list cf. Gering's critical apparatus, l. c.

¹² And the further emendation of Vigfússon, *Cpb.*, i, 295, does not help the matter.

¹³ L. c. in apparat.

tiquity. Of this minority Finnur Jónsson formerly regarded it¹⁹ as one of the oldest of its kind and even accepted a conjecture of Vigfússon,²⁰ that it was by the same author as the *Þrymskviða*, though he has evidently since given up the latter idea and speaks less positively of the poem's age.²¹ Mogk, on the other hand, who recognizes its close relation to the *Völuspá*, regards it as of later origin than, and in fact dependent upon, the latter.²² The same idea is developed more in detail by Neckel.²³

As the relation between the two poems seems to me rather the reverse of the one suggested by Mogk, I venture to give the reasons for my view. In so far as the current, mostly subjective, criteria for the relative age of the Eddic poems are concerned, Jónsson's judgment makes in this case the greater appeal to me, as the comprehensive and cumbersome *Völuspá* in terms of literary genre is at any rate later than the type of *Baldrs draumar*, which, when all is said and done, is precisely that of the admittedly ancient *Þrymskviða*.

The strophes of *Vsp.* which show practical identity of content with *Bdr.* are 28-34,²⁴ but I am inclined to believe that the whole composition of *Vsp.* was suggested by *Bdr.*, the latter furnishing the idea for a framework to the author's account of *ragnarøk*. The following tabulation of corresponding features in the two poems will serve to demonstrate their unquestionable relationship and can conveniently be made a basis for such deductions as follow therefrom :

<i>Vsp.</i>	<i>Bdr.</i>
The vǫlva is a giantess (str. 2).	The vǫlva is a giantess (str. 13).
When visited by the aged Odin (<i>enn aldri</i>) she is sitting alone in the open air (<i>úti.</i> , str. 28).	The aged Odin (<i>aldenn gautr</i> , str. 2, 13) rides to Nifhel to consult vǫlva ; he finds her eastward of Hel's gate, sleeping unprotected from snow, rain and dew (str. 2-5).

¹⁹ *Oldnorske og oldisl. litt. hist.*, I, 147 f., 1894. Cf. also Grundtvig, *Er Nordens gamle Literatur norsk? Hist. Tidskr.*, IV Række, I, 89 f., 1869.

²⁰ *Corp. poet. bor.*, I, 181, 1883.

²¹ *Isl. litt. hist.*, 1907, p. 48.

²² Paul's *Grundr.*, II, 582, 1904.

²³ *Beiträge zur Eddaforschung*, 1903, p. 59 ff.

²⁴ The numbers of the strophes cited are those of Sijmons' edition, Halle, 1888.

Odin questions her (str. 28) and gives her jewelry in payment for prophecy (str. 30).

She prophesies the death of Baldr and names Hǫr as his slayer (str. 32 ; 33, 1-2), and states further that a son of Odin, one night old, will take vengeance for his death (str. 33, 3-4 ; 34, 1-2.).

Valkyries are mentioned (str. 31) and the mourning of Frigg (str. 34, 3-4).

The vǫlva recognizes Odin apparently by fact that he has but one eye (str. 28, 4 ; 29).

The episode is followed by a strophe depicting Loki's imprisonment (str. 35). The conclusion of the poem is largely the account of *ragnarøk* and the new age following.

Odin puts 4 questions to her (str. 6, 8, 10, 12).

In answer to Odin's questions the vǫlva prophesies Baldr's death (str. 7), names Hǫr as his slayer (str. 9), and states that a son of Odin (*Váli?*), one night old, will take vengeance (str. 11 ; str. 11, 2-4 is almost word for word identical with *Vsp.* 33, 4 ; 34, 1-2).

Odin asks as the 4th question who the maids are that will mourn (str. 12, 3-4), the obvious answer, Valkyries, is lacking.

The vǫlva recognizes Odin apparently by his final question as to the maids that will mourn for Baldr (str. 13, 1-2).

The vǫlva concludes with a threatening allusion to the liberation of Loki and the coming of *ragnarøk*.

This comparison would suggest the following text-criticism of the *Vsp.*: str. 31, 1-2 with str. 34, 3-4 forms a single strophe following str. 34, 1-2 ; str. 31, 3-6 is an interpolated *pula*, the interpolation suggested by the mention of Valkyries ; str. 33 is incomplete, as verses 3-4 certainly do not belong with it ; str. 33, 3-4 with str. 34, 1-2 forms, on the other hand, the following complete strophe ; str. 35 perhaps does not belong to this episode at all. The original order of strophes of our episode would then have been 28 ; 29 (?) ; 30 ; 32 ; 33, 1-2 ; 33, 3-4 + 34, 1-2 ; 31, 1-2 + 34, 3-4.

With reference to the union of str. 31, 1-2 with str. 34, 3-4, it may be said that the mourning for Baldr played an important part in the old myths connected with his death, and Odin, Frigg and the Valkyries are in the *Gylfaginning* of *Snorra*

Edda expressly associated as mourners,²⁵ which association, so far as Odin and the Valkyries are concerned, goes back to the *Húsdrápa* of Ulfr Uggason, a scaldic poem of the tenth century.²⁶

If the lines are to be thus understood, the *goðbjóðar* of *Cod. reg.* must be interpreted as a collective term for the gods or their home, not as meaning Goths or land of the Goths, as is its common significance in the heroic songs of the *Edda* and of the *Hervarar saga*. Whether in these latter places *Goðbjóð* = "Goths," "land of Goths" be explained as a phonological development from *Gotbjóð*,²⁷ or as due to the influence of words compounded with *goð*,²⁸ the fact remains that both Goths and their country are out of place in *Vsp.* This fact was recognized by Müllenhoff, in that he suggested taking the word (*gotbjóðar*)²⁹ in appellative meaning as applicable to warriors or heroes generally, a meaning justified by no other occurrence and just as much at variance with the context as Goths or their country. The *vitt* of *komnar* applied to Valkyries can only mean "come from far and wide," or at most "come from a distance," and I cannot see why it should not signify that they were assembling from the plying of their vocation for the express purpose of attending Baldr's funeral rites. The idea that the Valkyries are represented here as going out to ply their vocation in mortal battles stands in relation to nothing that precedes or follows; it has by Müllenhoff (l. c.) been strained into accord with an utterly wrong theory of the poem's composition.

Valkyries as an answer to Odin's final question in *Bdr.*, inevitable as it would seem to be, does not agree with a current idea³⁰ that this question must be a riddle. This idea finds its justification through analogy with the final question (which

is, however, itself no riddle!) in *Vafþrúðnismál* and *Heiðreksǫgur*, first, in the fact that the *vǫlva* does not answer it, secondly, in the fact that through it she recognizes the identity of the questioner, Odin. Such is, however, not the inevitable conclusion from either fact, since the answer may be lacking because it is so self-apparent not only to the two beings concerned, but also to the poet's Icelandic audience; and, again, the *vǫlva*'s inference that Odin is the questioner may well rest upon the content of the questioner's self-apparent answer. That is, if it was a characteristic feature of the myth relating to Baldr's funeral that Odin attended accompanied by the Valkyries, as is amply attested by the *Húsdrápa*, an answer to this question was superfluous and the question itself was sufficient to betray the identity of the questioner, as it was meant to do.

The fact seems hardly to have been sufficiently emphasized that *Baldrs draumar* presents in every way an older phase of the Baldr-myth than do these verses of the *Vǫluspá*; it knows as yet nothing of the mistletoe as the destructive weapon and nothing of Loki's part in bringing about Baldr's death.³¹ It knows only that Baldr was slain by Høpr, who was in turn killed by a son of Odin with Rindr (*Váli*?), which corresponds in so far entirely with Saxo's version of the same myth.³²

²⁵ *Sn. Ed.*, Hafniae, 1848, I, p. 176.
²⁶ F. Jónsson, *Den norsk-islandske Skjaldedigtning*, I, 1908. A. p. 138, B. p. 129. Cf. Mogk, *PBBeitr.*, VII, 289 f., 1880.
²⁷ Heinzel, *Über die Hervarar saga*, Sitz.ber. d. phil.-hist. Cl. d. kais. Akad. d. Wiss. zu Wien, cxiv, Heft 2. Wien, 1887, p. 490.
²⁸ Noreen, *Altisl. und altnorw. Gram.*, § 240, Anm. 4, 1903.
²⁹ *Deutsche Altertumskunde*, v, p. 111; cf. p. 78, 1883.
³⁰ Cf. Bugge, *Studier*, I, 252 ff., 1881. Sijmons, *Lieder der Edda*, 163 in apparat., 1888, etc.
³¹ The *hróprbarm* of *Bdr.* 9 can in no sense mean the mistletoe, as "most investigators believe" (Neckel, *Beitr. z. Eddaforsch.* p. 61, 1908), but must, however it finally be spelled and explained, from the context refer to Baldr himself (cf. Gering, *Edda-Wörterbuch*, p. 466, Grundtvig, *Er Nordens gamle Litt. norsk?* p. 92 ff., 1869, *Scemundar Edda*, p. 187, 1868, etc.): *þiníg* means "to this place," i. e. to Hel, cf. use of *hér* in str. 7, for use of *berr* cf. *á bál of berr* in str. 11. Neither need the allusion in the last strophe of *Baldrs draumar* to Loki's part in ragnarök and his previous confinement be interpreted as indicating that Loki had played a leading rôle in the death of Baldr, in fact it brings Loki into no necessary relation with the preceding. If it be necessary to seek such relation, it would be most natural to find it in a connection with what most immediately precedes, identifying the *vǫlva* with the mother of the three gigantic beings begotten by Loki, as was done by Bergmann (*Weggewohns Lied*, Strassburg, 1875, p. 30, 35).

³² It may be noted by the way that the *Vsp.* also need not be interpreted as ascribing to Loki a part in the death of Baldr (cf. Niedner, *Zeitschr. f. deutsches Altert.*, 41, p. 307, 1897), in that its str. 35 does not stand in any neces-

If then *Bdr.* contains in some respects at least more original features of the Baldr-myth than *Vsp.* and the fact of an intimate relation between the two is indisputable, there remains but the question whether the author of *Vsp.* has used *Bdr.* or both go back directly or indirectly to a common source. Inasmuch as both show a nearly identical strophe, such common source can have been no other than a poetical one, *i. e.* at most an earlier version of the *Bdr.* or a very similar poem.³³ That the latter may have been the case I am not prepared to deny; on the contrary, I would only insist that such earlier version of the *Bdr.* can not have differed greatly from the one preserved, either in form or content. To the author of *Vsp.*, *Bdr.* suggested a framework for his primarily eschatological poem, the allusion to *ragnarøk* made by the *völva* in the last strophe being developed by him into a detailed account of that event and put into the mouth of the same *völva*.³⁴ This, as I am aware, does not at all correspond with Müllenhoff's theory of a three-fold structure of *Vsp.*,³⁵ but in spite of Müllenhoff's thunders one must accredit Bang³⁶ with a much less forced and artificial theory of the poem's composition, whether or not one agree with him entirely as to its sources.

A. LEROY ANDREWS.

Cornell University.

TEXTUAL NOTES ON THE ME. GENESIS AND EXODUS.

52 *ðat weldet alle ðinge wit rígt and [s] kíl.*

The metre requires *welt*, the form found in 54, two lines below.

369-370 *And nǫðful neddre, loð an líðer,
sal glíden on hise brest neðer.*

sary connection with the facts of the Baldr-myth preceding; in fact in the *Hauksbók*-version of *Vsp.*, from which the Baldr-strophes are lacking, this strophe appears, but in an entirely different place, *viz.*, after str. 24.

³³ Cf. Niedner, l. c., pp. 37 f., 309.

³⁴ With reference to the framework of *Vsp.*, see also Grundtvig, *Bemærkninger til Volvespaadommen*, særskilt aftryk af *Dansk Maanedsskrift*, 1866, andet Bind., p. 5 ff.

³⁵ *Deutsche Altertumskunde*, v, 5 ff.

³⁶ *Vǫluspáa og de Síðyllinske Orakler*, = Christiania Videnskabselskabs Forhandling, 1879, No. 9, p. 6 f.

The second line of the couplet would be greatly improved if we should read, *on his brest sal glíden neðer*. But emendations of this kind, of which a number have already been made by Kölbing, Holthausen, and others, are not entirely convincing. It always remains possible that the author was occasionally guilty of writing unmetrical lines.

519-521 *Also he god adde ofte bi-sogte,
Wislike was him in herte brogt
ðis midelerdes biginning.*

For *bi-sogte*, read *bisogt*.

659-661 *Nembrot gat his feres red
.
.
.
To maken a tur.*

Morris translates *gat* by 'granted.' Instead, read *gaf*, as in 1949, 4047, 4064. Cf. Comestor, *Gen.* 38, *Consilio Nemrod volentis regnare, coeperunt ædificare turrim.*

1207-1208 *Ðre ger woren ysaac on
Quane he was fro teding don.*

Morris in his notes explains *teding* as for *tending*. Holthausen, *Archiv*, cvii, 389, in support of this cites Comestor, *Gen.* 56, *ablactatus est*. The word should be *tetting* (= 'lactatio'). The verb *tetten* occurs 2612 (Kölbing's emendation for ms. *letten*). The noun *tette* occurs 2621, and *teten*, 3480.

1323-1324 *Oc abraham it wulde wel
quat-so god bad, ðwerted he it neuer
[a del.*

The second line of the couplet probably owes its length to the incorporation of a gloss. It originally read, *ðwerted he it neuer a del*. The antecedent of *it* in 1323, 1324, and in 1322 is the command of God of which Abraham tells in his previous speech. The words *quat-so god bad* were probably added by some reader to whom the *it* of 1323 seemed obscure. Cf. the footnote to p. 17 of Morris's edition for a similar gloss. A semicolon is needed after 1323.

1431-1432 *Or he wel homward cumen was,
Ysaac was cume to gerasis.*

Kölbing, *Eng. Stud.* III, 293, proposes to read *gerasas* or *geraras*. Comestor, *Gen.* 61, has, *Eo*